

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 14-20, 22, 23, 25-28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent 5,084,870 to Hutchinson et al. (Hutchinson) in view of US Patent Application Publication 2004/0223460 by Eldridge et al. (Eldridge). Claims 3, 6, 13, 21, 24, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of US Patent Application Publication 2006/0153562 by Dolbec et al. (Dolbec). Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of US Patent 6,381,643 to Bartfai et al. (Bartfai).

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 14-20, 22, 23, 25-28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge. Claims 3, 6, 13, 21, 24, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of Dolbec. Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of Bartfai. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 includes the limitations:

a detection module configured to detect a new connection at a network switch, the new connection facilitated by a first physical termination of a network cable, the network switch forming part of a data network;

a comparison module configured to compare the new connection to a connection rule, the connection rule defining a cabling connection, **wherein the connection rule depends on a network topology** and a type of cabling; and
a cabling connection module configured to control authorization of a network communication over the new connection in accordance with the connection rule.

Independent claims 14, 15, 19, 30, and 31 include similar limitations. In the final office action of April 23, 2008 (hereinafter OA080423), the Examiner argues that Hutchinson discloses the limitation “...**wherein the connection rule depends on a network topology**...” OA080423, page 3, lines 3-8 citing Hutchinson, col. 13, lines 41-59 and Figure 8. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hutchinson teaches using line states to determine connection types. Hutchinson, col. 13, lines 41-48. However, Hutchinson does not disclose a connection rule that depends on network topology. Network topology commonly refers to the interconnections between network devices. In Hutchinson, only line states and connection types are considered, the topology of the network is not considered. Applicants therefore submit that Hutchinson does not disclose the element of “...the connection rule depends on a network topology...”

Because Hutchinson and Eldridge do not disclose each element of claims 1, 14, 15, 19, 30, and 31, Applicants submit that claims 1, 14, 15, 19, 30, and 31 are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 2-13, 16-18, and 20-29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 9, 2008
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929